IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

LIFESTYLE COMMUNITIES, LTD., et al.,)	Civil Action 2:22-CV-1775
Plaintiffs,)	
V.)	Judge Sarah D. Morrison
CITY OF WORTHINGTON, OHIO,)	
Defendant.)	Magistrate Judge Elizabeth P. Deavers

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

EXHIBIT 20

LIFESTYLE COMMUNITIES

VS.

CITY OF WORTHINGTON

Deposition of

Beth Kowalczyk

November 10, 2023



614.460.5000 | www.priohio.com | pri@priohio.com

	November 10, 2020
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION
3	LIFESTYLE COMMUNITIES,)
4	LTD., ET AL.,)) Plaintiffs,)
5	vs.) Case No.
6) 2:22-cv-1775 CITY OF WORTHINGTON,
7	OHIO,
8	Defendant.)
9	
10	
11	DEPOSITION
12	of BETH KOWALCZYK
13	
14	Taken at Worthington City Hall 6550 North High Street
15	Worthington, Ohio 43085
16	
17	on November 10, 2023, at 8:58 a.m.
18	
19	Reported by: Julia Lamb, RPR, CRR
20	
21	-=0=-
22	
23	
24	

		Done O
1	APPEARANCES:	Page 2
2	Christopher L. Ingram VORYS SATER SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP	
3	52 East Gay Street	
4	Columbus, Ohio 43215 614.464.5480	
5	clingram@vorys.com	
6	on behalf of the Plaintiffs.	
7	Paul J. Schumacher	
8	DICKIE MCCAMEY 600 Superior Avenue East, Suite 2330	
9	Cleveland, Ohio 44114 216.390.1795	
10	pschumacher@dmclaw.com	
11	on behalf of the Defendant.	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	-=0=-	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

Page 3 1 STIPULATIONS 2 It is stipulated by and between 3 counsel for the respective parties that the 4 deposition of BETH KOWALCZYK, the Witness 5 herein, called by the Plaintiffs under the applicable Rules of Federal Civil Court 6 Procedure, may be taken at this time by the 7 8 stenographic court reporter and notary public by agreement of counsel; that said deposition may 9 be reduced to writing stenographically by the 10 11 court reporter, whose notes thereafter may be 12 transcribed outside the presence of the witness; 13 and that the proof of the official character and 14 qualification of the notary is waived. 15 -=0=-16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

			November	10, 2023
1		INDEX OF EXAMINATION		Page 4
2			PAGE	
3	BY MR. IN	GRAM:	6	
4				
5				
6		INDEX OF EXHIBITS		
7	EXHIBIT	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	
8	1	Land Use Plan	62	
9	6	Ordinance No. 04-2022	116	
10	7	Resolution No. 04-2022	124	
11	10	City Council Agenda, 1-18-22	111	
12	11	Email, 1-18-22, with attached document	123	
13	32	Memorandum, 1-22-19	51	
14 15	40	Email, 1-31-20, with attached Memorandum, 1-31-20	66	
16	41	City Council Minutes, 9-21-20	114	
17	42	One-page email chain with attached Summary of Phases	79	
18		for Development of the UMCH Property		
19	43	City Council Minutes,	92	
20	7.7	12-13-21	JL	
21	76	Email, 1-14-21, with attached Lifestyle Communities	84	
22		Development Application for the UMCH Site, Questions from		
23		City Councilmembers		
24				

			Novem	iber 10, 2023
1	98	WARD Presents Proposals for UMCH Site (January 2018)	29	Page 5
2	110	Email, 2-28-18, with attachments	23	
4	111	Two-page email chain	42	
5	112	Ten-page email chain	44	
6	113	Three-page email chain	58	
7	114	Three-page email chain, 10-5-20	71	
8 9	115	Two-page email chain, 11-1-20	81	
10	116	Two-page email chain, 3-31-21	88	
11	117	One-page Facebook post	109	
12	118	Two-page Facebook post	110	
13	119	Two-page email, 1-21-22	144	
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				

- 1 property to be one of many issues that are
- 2 significant to this community.
- 3 Q. Okay. So you do?
- 4 A. I don't think that this community --
- 5 this issue is an exclusively significant issue.
- 6 It's one of many.
- 7 Q. Do you agree that the property should be
- 8 rezoned to a planned unit development?
- 9 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. Relevance.
- 10 You can answer.
- 11 A. I would like to see something happen on
- 12 that property. Obviously there's a process that
- 13 that goes through.
- Q. Okay. But my question's a little bit
- 15 different. You know, looking at -- do you agree
- 16 that the property should be rezoned to a planned
- 17 unit development or something else?
- 18 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. You just
- 19 asked that question.
- 20 A. I would like to see something happen on
- 21 that property that would benefit the community.
- 22 The particular mechanism through which that
- 23 happens I don't have an opinion on. That's a
- 24 process that needs to be determined.

- 1 Q. Okay. And in your mind what would
- 2 benefit the community? In other words, what are
- 3 you referring to that could be redeveloped on
- 4 the site?
- 5 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. Asked and
- 6 answered.
- 7 A. That we have something that supports our
- 8 need for economic development, so commercial,
- 9 that certainly supports housing options for the
- 10 city, and that there be some park space, some
- 11 greenspace that is available for use by
- 12 residents and by the city, and frankly some
- 13 mixed use would be welcome.
- 14 Q. So mixed use development?
- 15 A. I guess if that's --
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection.
- 17 A. I guess if that's what you want to
- 18 characterize what I just said, but what I said
- 19 is what I said.
- -=0=-
- 21 (Deposition Exhibit 111 marked.)
- -=0=-
- 23 BY MR. INGRAM:
- Q. Handing you what's being marked as

- 1 MR. SCHUMACHER: Same objection.
- 2 A. Same answer.
- 3 Q. Exhibit 7 replaces Exhibit 1 -- is that
- 4 correct? -- in the city's comprehensive plan.
- 5 A. It's an amendment to the 2014
- 6 comprehensive plan amendment, and yes, my
- 7 understanding is it would replace that 2014
- 8 amendment.
- 9 Q. And so with respect to Exhibit 7, this
- 10 plan will guide and facilitate any future
- 11 development process for Lifestyle's property,
- 12 correct?
- 13 A. This 2022 amendment would essentially
- 14 serve the same purpose as the prior amendment
- 15 did in terms of being a guide for city staff and
- 16 for city council in evaluating development
- 17 proposals on the property.
- 18 Q. And there are guiding principles,
- 19 correct?
- 20 A. Yes, there on page 1 it says guiding
- 21 principles.
- Q. The first guiding principle is that the
- 23 development of Lifestyle's property be
- 24 considered and executed holistically as an

- 1 integrated whole. Is that correct?
- 2 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. That
- 3 misstates the principle.
- 4 A. That's what the document says. That it
- 5 is important that the development of the
- 6 property be considered and executed holistically
- 7 as an integrated whole.
- 8 Q. So can Lifestyle move forward with an
- 9 application to rezone a portion of its property
- 10 as opposed to the entire site?
- 11 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection to the
- 12 hypothetical nature, but you may answer.
- 13 A. This amendment and the comprehensive
- 14 plan are guidance documents. So Lifestyle could
- 15 propose to develop -- they could put forth a
- 16 proposal to develop the property in any manner
- 17 that they want, and it would be evaluated
- 18 against this and other things.
- 19 Q. Okay. If they move forward with an
- 20 application that only sought to develop, say, 10
- of the 40 acres of that property, it would be
- 22 contrary to this guiding principle, correct?
- 23 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection.
- 24 Hypothetical and argumentative.

- 1 A. It would depend on what the proposal is.
- 2 It is a hypothetical. I'm not going to give a
- 3 definitive answer on it.
- 4 Q. Okay. As a member of city council, what
- 5 is your understanding of this first guiding
- 6 principle, then?
- 7 A. Exactly what it says. It's important
- 8 that the development of the property be
- 9 considered and executed holistically as an
- 10 integrated whole, and that language is part of
- an amendment to the comprehensive plan which is
- 12 a guide to city council and to the city when
- 13 evaluating proposals.
- 14 Q. So the term executed -- I'm sorry,
- 15 strike that.
- 16 The phrase executed holistically as an
- 17 integrated whole, what does that mean to you as
- 18 a member of city council?
- 19 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection.
- You can answer.
- 21 A. Well, ideally the consideration would be
- 22 that there be a proposal that incorporates the
- 23 majority of the property and that it's
- 24 integrated in a sense that, you know, things

- 1 work together, but again, it really depends.
- 2 mean, in terms of evaluating from a land use
- 3 perspective, I can't say that. I'm not an
- 4 expert on how those terms are interpreted from
- 5 that perspective.
- 6 Q. Is this something that you would rely
- 7 upon the city staff for?
- 8 A. I would -- that would be part of my
- 9 review if something were to come before me,
- 10 would be city staff interpreting how a proposed
- 11 development would or would not apply to these
- 12 principles.
- Q. And with respect to the fourth guiding
- 14 principle, we seek an outcome on this land that
- 15 is distinctive, exceptional, and expressive of
- 16 Worthington's own values and community ethos.
- 17 Do you see that?
- 18 A. I see that.
- 19 Q. As a member of city council what is your
- 20 understanding of this guiding principle
- 21 concerning Lifestyle's property?
- 22 A. I don't understand your question. Are
- 23 you -- what are you asking me to do with this
- 24 statement?

- 1 O. What is your understanding of what this
- 2 means as a guiding principle dictating the
- 3 development of that property across the street?
- 4 A. I mean, they're aspirational goals of
- 5 what we would like to see on the property. I
- 6 mean -- and that it fits within the framework of
- 7 what we see in Worthington, and probably, you
- 8 know, frankly the rest of the comprehensive plan
- 9 has a lot of information on these items.
- 10 Q. Okay. I'm going to tell you I have no
- idea what this means and that's why I'm asking
- 12 you as a member of city council what -- what
- 13 type of plan or development would be expressive
- 14 of Worthington's community ethos? What does
- 15 that mean?
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. Move to
- 17 strike the comment of counsel and argumentative.
- 18 Is there a question?
- 19 A. Yeah. I'm sorry, what's the question?
- 20 MR. INGRAM: You can read back my
- 21 question, please.
- 22 (Record read as requested.)
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Same objection, but go
- 24 ahead.

- 1 A. I'm not going to attempt to define
- 2 community ethos. What I can tell you is an
- 3 example of something that I think fits within
- 4 this now is the Stafford Village to the Hartford
- 5 development.
- 6 Q. Okay. Why's that?
- 7 MR. SCHUMACHER: Can I have a continuing
- 8 objection to the hypothetical nature of these
- 9 questions?
- 10 MR. INGRAM: Sure.
- 11 MR. SCHUMACHER: Thank you.
- 12 A. It exhibits -- it fits within the
- 13 neighborhood. It serves a purpose for the
- 14 community. You know, I would want to have more
- 15 time to think about it so I'm not going to
- 16 expound on that. It just -- that's something
- 17 that came to my mind in looking at this, but I
- 18 think what you said was that we -- I in
- 19 particular -- I'm not a planner. I wouldn't
- 20 necessarily know how to interpret this as a
- 21 planner, but would rely on the city staff to
- 22 provide some guidance in that area.
- Q. Turning to the general components on the
- 24 following page of resolution 4-2022, the first

- 1 general component makes reference to a large
- 2 contiguous greenspace. Do you see that?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Large contiguous greenspace is
- 5 undefined, correct?
- 6 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection.
- 7 Argumentative.
- 8 A. It says a large contiguous greenspace.
- 9 Q. Okay. How large of a contiguous
- 10 greenspace is necessary to be approved under
- 11 this general component?
- 12 A. I'll go back to this is a guidance
- document that is used to evaluate proposals, and
- 14 so city staff would have some -- as they look at
- 15 a proposal, would look at these items and give
- 16 some feedback to us regarding whether they
- 17 thought it would apply. I mean, there's things
- 18 in here, there's things in the comprehensive
- 19 plan. They don't all have specific definitions.
- 20 They're guiding documents.
- Q. So there needs to be back and forth
- 22 between city staff, city council, and the
- 23 applicant, correct?
- 24 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. That

- 1 mischaracterizes her testimony.
- 2 A. It's not what I said. I said as they
- 3 evaluate this and provide city council
- 4 information about how they evaluate a proposal
- 5 against this plan.
- 6 Q. Okay. And in your mind what constitutes
- 7 a large contiguous greenspace as a member of
- 8 city council applying this plan to the rezoning
- 9 of the property across the street?
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Which application we
- 11 talking about?
- 12 A. Yeah, I don't know what application
- 13 you're talking about, and honestly, I wouldn't
- 14 be able to answer that question.
- 15 Q. Okay. And with respect to a greenspace,
- 16 what is an acceptable greenspace for that
- 17 property? What does that mean?
- 18 MR. SCHUMACHER: Same objection and
- 19 asked and answered.
- 20 A. And I'll give you the same answer. I
- 21 think it would be evaluated based on city
- 22 staff's recommendations and evaluation of the
- 23 proposal.
- Q. So other than referring to city staff's

- 1 evaluation of the proposal, what else, if
- 2 anything, would you refer to to understand what
- 3 large contiguous greenspace would be acceptable
- 4 for the property across the street?
- 5 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. Vague.
- 6 A. Yeah, I don't even know how to answer
- 7 that question. My process is when a proposal is
- 8 brought before council, I receive information
- 9 from city staff to evaluate that proposal, and I
- 10 rely on that information. And as I said before,
- 11 when a development is being proposed anywhere in
- 12 the city, if there are concerns or support or
- 13 any kind of feedback from city residents, then I
- 14 take that into consideration as well.
- 15 Q. As a member of city council where would
- 16 you direct Lifestyle to discern what this first
- 17 general component requires?
- 18 A. Probably the feedback that they've
- 19 already received from the MPC and city staff
- 20 that was outlined in the city memo related to
- 21 the existing -- I mean, this document isn't --
- 22 it's a little shorter, but it really doesn't
- 23 change I think the components of what we're
- looking for in the property based on the

- 1 comprehensive plan amendment. And you know, I
- 2 think there was some discussion of greenspace in
- 3 that response as well as other items where they
- 4 were evaluated against the plan amendment.
- 5 Q. With respect to the third general
- 6 component where it says that residential
- 7 housing, though requiring a rezoning, is
- 8 desirable, if it is creatively executed, do you
- 9 see that?
- 10 A. I do see that.
- 11 Q. As a member of city council what
- 12 constitutes creatively executed residential
- 13 housing for this property?
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Same objections.
- 15 A. Yeah, I'm not exactly sure how to define
- 16 creatively executed, and I would hesitate to do
- 17 that in any way that would be -- I mean, it's
- 18 just my opinion. It's not, again, something
- 19 that's evaluated by city staff who are experts
- in planning so I don't know if there's some
- 21 specific definition that could be applied there.
- Q. So you're not aware of any definition
- 23 that could be applied there. Is that fair?
- MR. SCHUMACHER: That's not what she

- 1 said. Objection.
- 2 A. Yeah, that's not what I said.
- 3 Q. Okay. Where's it defined then?
- 4 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. She just
- 5 gave you her answer.
- 6 A. I am not aware of whether there is a
- 7 definition used by city planners related to how
- 8 housing is executed and in this instance
- 9 creatively executed. There may be some
- 10 definition I'm not aware of.
- 11 Q. Okay. As a member of city council where
- 12 would you direct Lifestyle to discern what
- 13 constitutes creatively executed residential
- 14 housing on its property?
- 15 A. This is planning, land use and planning
- 16 execution. I would talk to city staff or
- 17 planners. I am not certain.
- 18 Q. With respect to the second general
- 19 component what constitutes acceptable select
- 20 service-oriented retail for this property in
- 21 your mind?
- 22 A. I'll go back to I believe that is
- 23 something that city staff would evaluate in
- terms of need, and that could change depending

- on when a proposal's brought forth, but there's
- 2 always evaluation of what the city needs in
- 3 terms of economic development and the type of
- 4 mixed use development that would suit a
- 5 neighborhood.
- 6 Q. Anything else?
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. And you voted against resolution 4-2022,
- 9 correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. In your experience has city council ever
- 12 considered legislation that affects only one
- 13 property owner without providing that property
- 14 owner advanced notice?
- 15 MR. SCHUMACHER: Objection. Relevance.
- 16 But you can answer.
- 17 A. Can you restate the question?
- 18 Q. In your experience has city council ever
- 19 considered legislation that affects only one
- 20 property owner without providing that property
- 21 owner advance notice?
- 22 A. Legislation I consider an ordinance.
- Q. All right. How about resolutions?
- MR. SCHUMACHER: Did you finish your

CERTIFICATE	Page 150
STATE OF OHIO :	
COUNTY OF FRANKLIN:	
I, Julia Lamb, RPR, CRR, a	in
and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned ar	nd
within-named BETH KOWALCZYK was first duly swoi	n
nothing but the truth in the cause aforesaid;	
me stenographically in the presence of said	/
foregoing is a true and correct transcript of	·+
the time and place in the foregoing caption	1 L
•	
relative, employee or attorney of any of the	
employee of any attorney or counsel employed by	/
interested in the action; and further, I am not	
affiliated, under contract as defined in Civil	П
set my hand at Columbus, Ohio, on this 20th day	/
or November, 20231	
Tulia Camb	
Notary Public, State of Ohio	
My commission expires: 10-10-27	
	STATE OF OHIO SS: COUNTY OF FRANKLIN: I, Julia Lamb, RPR, CRR, a stenographic court reporter and notary public rand for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned ar qualified, do hereby certify that the within-named BETH KOWALCZYK was first duly swort to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in the cause aforesaid; that the testimony then given was taken down by me stenographically in the presence of said witness, afterwards transcribed; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony; that this deposition was taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified. I do further certify that I am not a relative, employee or attorney of any of the parties hereto; that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto; that I am not financially interested in the action; and further, I am not nor is the court reporting firm with which I am affiliated, under contract as defined in Civil Rule 28(D). In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand at Columbus, Ohio, on this 20th day of November, 2023. Julia Lamb, RPR, CRR Notary Public, State of Ohio

Beth Kowalczyk - Worthington...



Posts

About

Videos

More *



Beth Kowalczyk - Worthington City Council

Dec 19, 2021 - 3

Worthington City Council voted unanimously at its December 13, 2021 meeting to deny the development proposal submitted by Lifestyle Communities (LC) for the former United Methodist Children's Home (UMCH) property.

If LC wants to submit a new application, it must wait at least six months after the October 2021 Municipal Planning Commission recommendation of denial, which would be mid-April 2022.

For more information, including a link to the meeting, check out the city's web page devoted to this proposal: https://worthington.org/624/UMCH-Development-Proposal



dispatch.com

Worthington City Council denies Lifestyle Communities' rezoning request to redevelop form...















EXHIBIT

117